Remarks

In the Office action mailed October 19, 2005, independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 11 were rejected. Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,223 ("Kozaru et al."). Claims 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozaru et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,111,808 ("Khang et al."). Dependent claims 2-4, 7, and 9-10 were objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. The rejections and objections will be discussed below.

§ 102(b)

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kozaru et al. In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach all the elements of a claim. See Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In addition, the reference must show the claimed invention "in as complete detail as in contained in the patent claim" in order to anticipate the claimed invention. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants assert that Kozaru et al. fails to teach each of the elements of Applicants' claims and does not show the claimed invention in as complete detail as contained in the patent claim; therefore, the claims are not anticipated.

Claim 1

Kozaru et al. fails to teach Applicants' claimed element of "selecting said plurality of words to be read, each of said selected plurality of words having a first group of

words and at least one subsequent group of words." Amended claim 1. Kozaru et al. teaches that memory sub-arrays are selected; however Kozaru et al. does not specifically teach selecting a plurality of words to be read, where each selected plurality of words has a first group of words and at least one subsequent group of words. See, e.g., Kozaru et al., col. 14, ln. 28-38. Since Kozaru et al. fails to teach all the elements of Applicants' claim in as complete detail as contained in Applicants' claim, Applicants' claim 1 is novel. Applicants request a withdrawal of this rejection.

Further, Kozaru et al. fails to teach Applicants' claimed element of "reading selected plurality of words into a plurality of data registers during a latency period." Amended claim 1. Instead, Kozaru et al. teaches that each selected memory cell in a selected memory block is read at each clock cycle and another selected memory cell in another selected memory block is read during the following clock cycle. See Kozaru et al., col. 13, ln. 1-12. Kozaru et al. does not disclose reading the selected **plurality** of words during a latency period. Kozaru et al. therefore fails to teach all the elements of Applicants' claim in as complete detail as contained in Applicants' claim. Claim 1 is therefore novel and Applicants request a withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 11

Kozaru et al. fails to teach Applicants' claimed element of a burst controller adapted to receive a variable latency signal. The control circuit taught by Kozaru et al.'s Fig. 27 is associated with five signals: a clock signal ("CLK"); an advance signal ("ADV"); an address strobe signal ("ADS"); an output enable signal ("OE"); and a write enable signal ("WE"). See id., col. 1, ln. 30-49. None of these signals is a variable latency signal. A variable latency signal is not taught elsewhere in Kozaru et al. Therefore,

Kozaru et al. does not teach all the elements of Applicants'
claim in as complete detail as contained in Applicants' claim.
Applicants' claim 1 is novel and Applicants request a
withdrawal of this rejection.

§ 103(a)

Claims 5 and 8 were rejected as obvious under Kozaru
et al. in view of Khang et al. In order to make a showing of
obviousness, a reference or references must teach all the
limitations of a claim and there must be some suggestion or
motivation in either the references or the knowledge generally
available to one of skill in the art to modify the reference
or combine reference teachings. See MPEP § 2143. These
requirements for a showing of obviousness have not been met
and therefore the claims are not obvious.

Claim 5

Neither Kozaru et al. nor Khang et al., alone or in
combination, teaches or suggests at least two limitations of
Applicants' claim 5. Specifically, these references fail to
teach or suggest:

> a sub bitline decoder coupled to a main
> bit line of said memory system for decoding
> a most significant bit of said plurality of
> words to be read and for determining whether
> an address of said plurality of words is a
> lower or higher word address;
> a first tier decoder coupled to said
> sub bitline decoder to select both said even
> and odd addresses of said plurality of words
> for a first reading during a latency period
> . . . . Claim 5.

Therefore, this claim is not obvious.

Kozaru et al. and Khang et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' "a sub bitline decoder coupled to a main bit line of said memory system for decoding a most significant bit of said plurality of words to be read and for determining whether an address of said plurality of words is a lower or higher word address." Amended claim 5. Kozaru et al. teaches a global decoder, but does not teach or suggest a global decoder for decoding a most significant bit of said plurality of words to be read and for determining whether an address of said plurality of words is a lower or higher word address, as Applicants do. Khang et al. similarly fails to teach or suggest this element of Applicants' claim. Since neither reference, alone or in combination, teaches this limitation of Applicants' claim, this claim is not obvious. Applicants request a withdrawal of this rejection.

Kozaru et al. and Khang et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' "first tier decoder coupled to said sub bitline decoder to select both said even and odd addresses of said plurality of words for a first reading during a latency period." Amended claim 5. Applicants have shown above that Kozaru et al. fails to teach or suggest reading a plurality of words during a latency period. Khang et al. also fails to teach or suggest reading a plurality of words during a latency period. Neither of these references, alone or in combination, teaches this limitation; therefore, this claim is not obvious. Applicants request a withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 8

Kozaru et al. and Khang et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach Applicants' claimed limitation "a first selecting means for selecting both said even and odd addresses for a first reading during a latency period." Amended claim 8. Applicants have shown above that Kozaru et

al. fails to teach or suggest reading a plurality of addresses (i.e., even and odd addresses) during a latency period. Khang et al. also fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Neither of these references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this claim limitation. This claim is therefore nonobvious and Applicants request a withdrawal of this rejection.

Added Claims

The Office action indicated that the application's dependent claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have added claims 14 and 15. Claim 14 combines independent claim 5 and dependent claim 6. Claim 15, which depends from claim 14, is based on claim 7. Applicants request these added claims be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8 and added new claims 14 and 15. Applicants have shown that each of the claims is novel and nonobvious. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signed: _____

Typed Name: Sally Azevedo

Date:_____December 30, 2005_____

Respectfully submitted,

Nissa M. Strottman
Reg. No. 52,257

P.O. Box 2-E
San Jose, CA 95109-0005
(408) 297-9733

ATM55:279.AMT